

Claremont Colleges Scholarship @ Claremont

CGU MFA Theses

CGU Student Scholarship

5-1-2012

Tutti Frutti

Damaris G. Rivera
Claremont Graduate University

Recommended Citation

Rivera, Damaris G., "Tutti Frutti" (2012). *CGU MFA Theses*. Paper 56.
http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgu_mfatheses/56

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the CGU Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in CGU MFA Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

Damaris Rivera
Thesis Statement

For this exhibition the gallery will serve as subject, material, surface and armature. The gallery is a muse, a vessel, and a tool for propaganda. Anything that happens in the gallery is essentially about the gallery, that is to say *it happened in the gallery*.

Mark making is equivalent with making a place one's own. Demarcation of a site is not solely a negative act. The negation of a space is pre-transcribed, presupposed. The point is to take the negative and invert it. It's not a one-way street. In order to change the building you have to move through the building and let the building move through you. Once the building lives in the occupant the experience of the building can be altered. Total absorption of architecture and its environment can provide a means to live in a unified expressive way. It's about the person. The individual. Confidant and willing, anyone can make a place their own. Make anything their own. Express themselves in any context. Throw on shades and deal with it.

My reliance on the exhibition space as an activator for art has become a vehicle for addressing the building as the art not the backdrop for the art. If the gallery is white and unpleasant it can be covered like a canvas or a body. Dressing the building, like dressing my body is an extension of my person as mark making is to the painter. Art without true utilitarian function resulting from material desire is analogous to the body and its lack of political power. Why should the objectified body be worse off than the object? I can make the Cartier bracelet, which sits on the wrist, be seen as no different than the (fill-in-the-blank) painting above the couch.

This attitude in art making may be viewed as decorating; decor- the ugly petty action seen to be inferior to craft and discouraged in *fine art*. Suppose decor should make a grand entrance and sashay into the gallery. When does the *art* in the gallery end and the decor of the lobby begin?

Give the building what it wants. A crown. It lacks a crown. Other buildings get a crown. Give the building a crown.

Give the inside of a gallery what it wants. The outside. Bring the outside in. It wants shrubs.

Give the artist what it wants. A history. And money. And a party. Give the artists a party. Have a ball.

Give the art opening what it wants. Some pieces. So maybe they are fragments. So what. It still looks good with some white and some pedestals.

Give the building a drink. Spray the sprinkler on it. A toast to crew.

